

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
MINUTES**

**September 26, 2007  
Wednesday, 11:45-1:45 p.m., Kerr Hall, Room 307**

Present: Joel Ferguson (Provost Rep), Russ Flegal, David Helmbold, Pamela Hunt-Carter (Registrar, ex officio), Roxanne Monnet (ASO Staff), Loisa Nygaard, Jaye Padgett (Chair), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (NSTF), Kip Tellez, Jack Vevea.

Absent: Jamal Atiba (SUA Rep).

Guests: Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Pamela Edwards (ASO Staff to CAFA), Susan Gillman (CPB Chair), Mary-Beth Harhen (Senate Director and Staff to CPB), Richard Hughey by phone (CAFA Chair), Elaine Kihara (Academic Preceptor Designee), Bill Ladusaw (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Michael McCawley (Acting Director of Admissions), Marlene Robinson (Awards and Honors Coordinator, VPDUE Office).

**I. Introductions, Announcements, and Meeting Overview.**

Members, representatives, and guests introduced themselves.

Chair Padgett noted that there is not a member from the Division of the Arts on the Committee for 2007-08. Members were asked to keep that division particularly in mind throughout this year's work.

The group was reminded that CEP has returned to meetings two hours in length during every Wednesday of the quarter.

It was announced that there will be a Senate forum on professional schools on October 10 in lieu of a Senate Meeting (Stevenson Multipurpose Room, 3-5 p.m.).

The CEP Chair gave a brief overview of CEP's charge and activities, including its connection to the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), the Graduate Council, the Committee on Teaching, University Extension, and the Office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education and Summer Session.

**II. General Education Reform.**

Chair Padgett provided the Committee with a handout regarding General Education which included an overview of General Education at UCSC as it stands presently.

He described the distinction of "core" versus "distributional" GE systems. The core system involves shared academic experiences of students and is coherent by nature, being a closed system, whereas, a distributional system allows students a lot of choice in what they take.

Faculty are more likely to agree on such a system, given the flexibility. Purely core systems are rare. Most Universities have a basically distributional system.

The handout reviewed purposes for a general education curriculum and gave some reasons for reassessing UCSC's GE system which has not been changed for more than 20 years. The document also included a list of things for CEP to assess and possibly reform plus possibilities on how to proceed and potential future issues.

The group was informed that C2 courses, unlike C1 courses, are not necessarily affiliated with a college. C2 courses in and out of the colleges must adhere to a set of guidelines, which will be provided to CEP in the near future. In fact, C2 courses currently exist only in the Writing Program and colleges.

In addition to imparting wisdom and fostering breadth to students, GE curriculum aims to further develop critical thinking, writing and other communications skills, quantitative/formal reasoning, research experience, understanding of different cultures, and ethical exploration. Additionally, GE can foster identity or affiliation and, thus, help with retention of students to degree completion. CEP should think about what purposes they want to achieve and design GE (and where appropriate) major curriculum in accord with the goals—perhaps a rethinking of GE as separate from major curriculum and instead think about just what we want students to get while here. Speculation was given that faculty teaching upper-division courses sometimes presume that students have the skills set listed above by the time they reach that level and decide not spend time on these in their class.

It was noted that WASC is expecting reconsideration of our GE system by our next review. This is scheduled to begin with a report submitted by UCSC in 2010.

Another problem noted with the current GE system is that it lacks clarity for faculty advising students.

It has been 23 years since the last overhaul of UCSC's GE system. Reassessment of UCSC's general education system is overdue. All faculty should feel like they "own" our GE system and have the responsibility to maintain it.

Another objective of the current GE review should be considering UCSC's educational objectives. Although some mention is made of these in the 1984 document which underlie our current system, and in the catalog and the navigator, these are insufficient and have not recently been vetted through the faculty. In a report to WASC, approved by the Senate in 2004, an attempt was made to state the educational objectives for UCSC based on the above sources.

Chair Padgett summarized "modes of inquiry" as used by Duke University. One possibility is to enlarge the bits of a distributional-style system that UCSC currently has and develop thematically unified clusters of courses, possibly tied to the colleges.

How to proceed next was discussed in brief, including the possibility of the first spring Senate Meeting having a focus on GE reform topics. Concern was expressed that faculty attendance at

these can be low. However, if a proposal goes to faculty for the April 30 meeting it is hoped that faculty will comment well before legislation is before them. A possible timeline was reviewed. The need for outreach and consulting with the faculty was underscored, such as communicating with the departments individually.

Members would like to know more about what others institutions are doing, ways of determining what we want from students, plans for building awareness and getting Faculty buy-in. Concern was expressed regarding the time involved. The CPB chair described how they take on initiatives as a committee. The value of subcommittees was discussed. The question was raised as to a possible increase in staff support in order for this the effort to move forward. CEP was encouraged to consider what they want to do and what would be the associated needs for staff support, and not to be initially limited by available hours of staff support, but to consider making a request to the Senate Director.

Regarding the writing-intensive (W) requirement, Chair Padgett provided a handout and discussed work done over the summer to resolve some of the high-impact departments, where need for W courses for their majors are most needed. Proposals have been submitted by the Departments of Psychology and MCD Biology. Others from philosophy, computer science, and art are hoped for. The pilot should involve at least one department per division. Politics would be another important department to work with during the pilot. It is hoped that once these departments are on-board with ways for their majors to satisfy the W requirement, related legislation would have the needed support of the Faculty to pass.

### **III. Honors.**

VPDUE Ladusaw provided a handout on honors at UCSC and relayed what he hopes to accomplish this year through his office, in collaboration with the Senate. He has a goal to acknowledge undergraduate achievement while stimulating more opportunities for academic challenge in an effort to retain and recruit more students.

He noted that past CEPs have given support for the Deans' List as well as for Latin designations. He recommends a review of the first-year students in order to invite a percent of them to join an honors program. It should be possible for entering students to be admitted to the program based on their work during their first year at UCSC. He also hopes to work with CAFA regarding the possibility of offering early admission to the honors program. Another goal of his for this year is for routine publicizing of honors tracks within departments.

The need for an honors core course was discussed. The importance of tapping into community college honors programs for transfer students was noted. He would like to work with CAFA for strategic alignment of the deployment of scholarship resources with evidence of continued academic success at UCSC. The benefits of annual reporting were noted, to be done in collaboration with the Registrar's Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Policy Studies.

CEP was informed that UCSC is the only UC campus without an honors program.

The Committee learned that the Deans' List was discontinued because of its parameters that needed to be manually maintained in order to accommodate the division-by-division uniqueness in defining who makes the list. For it to be sustainable, a uniform standard is needed, such as by using solely the GPA as the basis for determining who makes the List. If the goal is for UCSC to take notice who did well in a given term, what level of detail is really necessary to making these awards? The downside of not considering the rigor of a student's courses for GPA was noted as relates to both the deans' list and honors at graduation.

A student's being on the Deans' List would not of itself define who is invited to join an honors program. Acting Director of Admissions McCawley commented on UCSC's disadvantage in competing and retaining top scholars due to the lack of an honors program which needs to be both substantive and sustainable.

It is hoped that inviting students into an honors program toward the end of year one may aid in retaining top scholars through their sophomore and junior years. The vision for an honors program is performance based. VPDUE Ladusaw hopes to work toward articulation of the departmental intensive tracks into honors tracks.

Last year's CAFA Chair conducted a review of the performance of Regents Scholars during their time here. The outcome for some students was disappointingly lower than expected based on performance and/or a low number of credits taken quarterly. CAFA will be looking at modifying their way of giving Regents Scholarships that would require continued high performance.

Chair Padgett handed out a list of CEP goals in the area of honors at graduation which included University honors campuswide, college and department/program honors which could be unique, but guided by recommended thresholds provided by CEP. Some colleges may choose not to give honors if theirs have too much overlap with campuswide honors criteria.

How those who complete an Honors Program will fit into honors designations for graduation needs to be discussed at a future date.

#### **IV. Retention.**

Chair Padgett provided a handout related to retention. Last year's effort to create a taskforce on retention was relayed to the Committee. The proposal is currently with Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Kliger and is expected be approved soon, after which a steering committee will be convened. CEP needs to designate a representative for that steering committee. VPDUE Ladusaw asked for clarification as to whether the proposal is for a joint Senate/Administration committee or an administrative committee co-chaired by him and a representative from CEP. Senate Director Harhen explained that this proposal did not go through the process of a joint committee and, thus, it is a co-chaired administrative committee. Registrar Hunt-Carter requested to be on the list to receive minutes from this steering committee in order to remain informed and provide feedback in a timely fashion. VPDUE Ladusaw described that the steering committee would constitute a small core group but that there would be a larger consulting group which would include the Registrar and CPB, among others. It is

recognized that including CPB in the larger consulting group could be beneficial for data collecting.

**V. Academic Integrity.**

Chair Padgett briefly described where last year's CEP left off on the topic of academic integrity. It is not so much the policy that is a problem at present; rather the issue appears to be awareness of the policies and consistent application of them. A staff portal on this topic is being developed. EVC Kliger indicated to the CEP Chair that a faculty portal should happen this quarter. CEP is invited to look at the mock up pages.

Members were asked to consider which of the above topics they would prefer to be more involved with as subcommittee work is assigned. They were invited to consider any additional items that they would like CEP to consider this year

So attests,

Jaye Padgett, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy